

## REMARKS

Claims 1-48 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 1, 18, 21-22, 29 and 45 have been amended in this paper. No new matter has been added.

### **Rejection of Claims 1-9, 12-29, 32-33, 38-39 and 44-48 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) As Being Anticipated By Schneiderman**

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 recites receiving a plurality of message objects at an event source platform, the message objects being generated by a user able to access the event source platform, and filtering the received message objects with a mobile agent object executing in the event source platform.

For example, referring, *e.g.*, to FIG. 4 and paragraphs 32-41, mobile agent objects work together to filter and collect messages, such as email or voicemail messages, at event source platforms 220 and 230 which meet a particular requirement of a user. The requirements are encoded as the event triggers and message properties contained within the mobile agent objects from configuration. Once determined to be relevant, *e.g.*, filtered, messages are sent to a collection host platform 210 and stored in a message database 211 for later retrieval by a redirection method described elsewhere in the specification. The message objects may include voice-mail messages, email messages, text messages or other objects generated by a user able to access the event source platform.

In contrast, Schneiderman fails to teach or suggest receiving a plurality of message objects at an event source platform, the message objects being generated by a user able to access the event source platform, and filtering the received message objects with a mobile agent object executing in the event source platform. Referring, *e.g.*, to FIG 3e, column 8, line 61 to column 9, line 10, and column 11, lines 29-61 of Schneiderman, all mobile agents run within an environment known as an "agent server" of which there are two types, end node 18 and intermediate node

6. Built upon the agent servers are other, more complex subsystems. Agent debugger 5 stores the stack traces of agents as they execute within the agent server environment.

The agent debugger 5 includes an object manager 85 and event monitor component 87. To quote column 11, lines 41- 47, “[o]bject manager 85 tracks the creation of all mobile agent objects as they are instantiated and allowed to execute within an agent server environment. Event monitor component 87 receives events generated by the agent server environment. The events are filtered to allow only those events denoting the preparation of a class (object creation) as well as method entry points being reached.”

The Applicant’s attorney respectfully submits that even if, *arguendo*, the “events” described by Schneiderman qualify as message objects generated by a living user as contemplated by the limitations of claim 1 (which, Applicant’s attorney contends, they do not), there is simply nothing in the teachings of Schneiderman to indicate that a mobile agent object is involved in such filtering, as is required by the limitations of claim 1. In fact, Schneiderman’s passive statement that “[t]he events are filtered” provides no definite indication of what, precisely, performs this filtering function. As such, the teachings of Schneiderman cannot fairly and reasonably be said to anticipate the novel limitations of claim 1.

Moreover, the Examiner states on page 8 of the instant Office Action that “Schneiderman teaches in (paragraph 163) an object type that is an agent message associated with a mobile agent process running on a remote machine; and in (paragraph 121) all running mobile agent processes are associated with events that are filtered for the preparation of object creation. Therefore the teaching of Schneiderman’s reference meets the claimed limitation of the claim.” The Applicant’s attorney respectfully submits that the conclusion that Schneiderman teaches the limitations of claim does not in any way follow from the Examiner’s stated interpretation of the teachings of Schneiderman. The fact remains that the Examiner has yet to point out with any specificity how, for example, Schneiderman teaches that a mobile agent object performs a filtering function on the “event.” In other words, simply pointing out that a reference teaches mobile agent objects and

teaches filtering events does not mean, *ipso facto*, that the reference teaches that the mobile agent objects perform such filtering. Consequently, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection

**Claims 18, 21, 22, 29 and 45**

Claims 18, 21, 22, 29 and 45 are patentable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1.

**Claims 2-9, 12-17, 19-20, 23-28, 32-33, 38-39, 44 and 46-48**

Claims 2-9, 12-17, 19-20, 23-28, 32-33, 38-39, 44 and 46-48 are patentable by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 1, 18, 22, 29 and 45.

**Rejection of Claims 10-11, 30-31, 34-37 and 40-43 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Schneiderman In View of Cheyer**

Cheyer fails to supply the teachings missing from Schneiderman, namely receiving a plurality of message objects at an event source platform, and filtering the received message objects with a mobile agent object executing in the event source platform.. As such Schneiderman and Cheyer, taken each alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the limitations of claims 1 and 29. Accordingly, claims 10-11, 30-31, 34-37 and 40-43 are patentable by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 1 and 29.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant requests a finding of allowability for all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned. **If the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant's position that all pending claims are allowable, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to arrange a telephonic discussion of the claims prior to issuing an Advisory Action rejecting any claim in view of the references discussed herein.**

Respectfully submitted,  
BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM<sup>PLLC</sup>  
/P.G. Scott Born/  
P. G. Scott Born  
Registration No. 40,523  
Direct Dial: 206.957.2491